

Comprehensive Plan Report

A detailed report showing activity of the school team's work on the improvement plan including assessments, plans, tasks, monitoring, and implementation for selected time periods.

November 19, 2013

Peabody Middle School NCES - na

Petersburg City Public Schools

Transformation Toolkit

Key Indicators are shown in **RED**.

Transformation Toolkit			
Strand K: Reforming Instruction			
Indicator	K2 - The principal focuses on building leadership capacity, achieving learning goals, and improving instruction. (971)		
Status	Tasks completed: 0 of 1 (0%)		
Assessment	Level of Development:	Initial: Limited Development 10/17/2013	
	Index:	6	(Priority Score x Opportunity Score)
	Priority Score:	3	(3 - highest, 2 - medium, 1 - lowest)
	Opportunity Score:	2	(3 - relatively easy to address, 2 - accomplished within current policy and budget conditions, 1 - requires changes in current policy and budget conditions)
	Describe current level of development:	<p>Key) K2 - The principal focuses on building leadership capacity, achieving learning goals, and improving instruction. (971)</p> <p>The principal will closely work with assistant principals and other instructional leadership team in order to build leadership capacity amongst this group (Lambert, 2001); and subsequently-school-wide. The intentions are for these formal leaders to work collaboratively as a team to ensure that the learning and teaching improvement goals are achieve during the (2013-14) school year. These objectives will be achieve through professional development, book studies, jointly analyzing student performance data, and providing leadership opportunities for designated team.</p>	
Plan	Assigned to:	Jerome Williams	
	How it will look when fully met:	All member of the instructional leadership team will have proficient knowledge of data driven decision making to improve instruction, running a meetings, managing resources to achieve objectives. A clear display of distributive leadership amongst the instructional team. This will be evident by an increase in student performance on Benchmarks and SOL summative assessments. The culture and climate will improve as compared to survey data from 2012-13.	
	Target Date:	06/15/2014	
	Tasks:		
	1. Establish an Instructional leadership team.		
	Assigned to:	Jerome Williams	
	Added date:	10/17/2013	
	Target Completion Date:	08/20/2013	
	Frequency:	monthly	

		Comments:	During the summer, 7/29/2013, administration met to select members of the instructional leadership team based on ability to lead, knowledge of instruction , SOL performance, ability to analyze data and implement \strategies that will ensure increase student performance on SOL summative assessments, and interview.
Implement	Percent Task Complete:	Tasks completed: 0 of 1 (0%)	

Indicator	K3 - The principal aligns professional development with classroom observations and teacher evaluation criteria. (972)		
Status	Tasks completed: 0 of 2 (0%)		
Assessment	Level of Development:	Initial: Limited Development 10/17/2013	
	Index:	6	(Priority Score x Opportunity Score)
	Priority Score:	3	(3 - highest, 2 - medium, 1 - lowest)
	Opportunity Score:	2	(3 - relatively easy to address, 2 - accomplished within current policy and budget conditions, 1 - requires changes in current policy and budget conditions)
	Describe current level of development:	(Key) K3 - The principal aligns professional development with classroom observations and teacher evaluation criteria. (972) After observing the instructional practices of teachers for three weeks (September 3-26) and reviewing the SOL summative assessment student performance data from (2012-13) school year, it was determined that the effectiveness of instructional delivery (Teacher Performance Standard-3) there is a critical need for teacher support and professional development in this area of instructional weakness. Being concurrent with our division's strategic goals for improving teaching and learning it was decided by the site-administrative team to utilize the work of John Hattie Visible Learning For Teachers Maximizing Impact On Learning (Hattie,2012) to achieve this goal. Teachers were intruded to the work of John Hattie in PLC meeting and initially provided a list of the top thirty HYS and descriptions of each. To further facilitate this process, we Partnered with the SURN Principal Academic which allowed all core area teachers to participate in an ongoing action research project which will includes a book study on Visible Learning For Teachers Maximizing Impact On Learning and professional development activities that focus on student engagement and visible teaching with emphasis on integrating HYS in daily lesson for maximum teaching and learning effectiveness. Therefore, all teachers are required to explicitly employ five HYS in each lesson plan.	
Plan	Assigned to:	Jerome Williams	
	How it will look when fully met:	All teachers will explicitly include at minimum of Five HYS in daily lesson plans. During observations and walk through it should be evident that teachers are utilizing John Hattie's suggested strategies to improve teaching and learning. During Professional Learning communities (PLC) there should be evident of discussion focused on the implementation and execution of these strategies. Full School-wide Student engagement will be evident in each classroom. Classroom mismanagement concerns will be minimum School-wide discipline infractions will decrease by 40% in comparison to (2012-13) data.	
	Target Date:	03/28/2014	
Tasks:			
	1. Provide SURN with the names and emails of the core area teachers who will participate in the book study and action research project.		
	Assigned to:	Jerome Williams	

		Added date:	10/17/2013
		Target Completion Date:	10/03/2013
		Comments:	Attend SURN principal meeting in late September. During the second nine week period, administration plans to identify the participants for the action research project and book study. During November's faculty meeting, administration will discuss with faculty the expectations of participants and discuss the desired objectives and outcomes.
	2. Provide professional development Activities that focus on John Hattie's High Yield Strategies and student engagement		
		Assigned to:	Jerome Williams
		Added date:	10/17/2013
		Target Completion Date:	10/08/2013
		Frequency:	monthly
		Comments:	-The administrative team will conduct a workshop on high yield strategies and student engagement. The focus will be an instruction to HYS via a power point presentation. Video by John Hattie. Discussion of research finding regarding HYS and student engagement. Lesson plan development (by grade level/content teachers) using the HYS and learning intension approach. Group activities for active teacher participation
Implement	Percent Task Complete:		Tasks completed: 0 of 2 (0%)

Indicator	K4 - The principal ensures that teachers align instruction with standards and benchmarks. (974)		
Status	Tasks completed: 0 of 2 (0%)		
Assessment	Level of Development:	Initial: Limited Development 10/17/2013	
	Index:	6	(Priority Score x Opportunity Score)
	Priority Score:	3	(3 - highest, 2 - medium, 1 - lowest)
	Opportunity Score:	2	(3 - relatively easy to address, 2 - accomplished within current policy and budget conditions, 1 - requires changes in current policy and budget conditions)
	Describe current level of development:	(Key) K4 - The principal ensures that teachers align instruction with standards and benchmarks. (974) PCPS Division requires the teachers, site based instructional specialists, and central office to work collaboratively in the development, implementation, and execution of benchmark assessments. Therefore and specialist are assigned by the principal to teachers work in content area specific teams. The teams have standing meeting (minimum three times per month) Teams meet by grade level and depart to insure vertical and horizontal articulation of strategic goals. To ensures that instructional alignment with SOLs and benchmarks, during these meeting teachers develop collaborate to develop lesson plans and subsequent common formative assessment which are content specific. Also, bi-monthly assessments developed which are aligned with the pacing guides, curriculum frame work, and prescribed testing blue prints. These meeting are attended by an administrator or a instructional specialist.	
Plan	Assigned to:	Jerome Williams	
	How it will look when fully met:	Teachers meeting each week in Collaborative Learning Teams (CLT) Teams focused on standard curriculum Unified daily lesson plan development and implementation each day Common formative assessments among content and grade level teaches bi-monthly assessments. Evidence rich task discussion in minutes of meetings A gradual increase on Bi-monthly assessments. A 10% increase student performance data on (1st- 3rd) Benchmark assessments	
	Target Date:	11/08/2013	
Tasks:			
		1. Develop and Utilize pacing guides in core area subjects (English, Math, Science, and Social Studies) to drive instruction.	
		Assigned to:	Jerome Williams
		Added date:	10/17/2013
		Target Completion Date:	09/03/2013
		Frequency:	three times a year

		Comments:	PLC meetings take place every Monday during the collaborative planning sessions of the teachers and CLT meetings take place on Wednesdays of the planning sessions. During these meetings, there will be a review of the prescribed curriculum framework provided by VDOE. During the 8/27/2013 PLC meeting, teachers generated a pacing guide which includes both bi-monthly and benchmark assessments. Teachers also developed a 45 day plans which was aligned with the pacing guides and standard curriculum. Each 9 week period, teachers will come together to create these 45 day plans.
		2. -Review pacing guides in CLT meeting and make adjustments if necessary.	
		Assigned to:	Sinclair Harris
		Added date:	10/17/2013
		Target Completion Date:	10/30/2013
		Frequency:	twice monthly
		Comments:	
Implement	Percent Task Complete:		Tasks completed: 0 of 2 (0%)

REQUIRED for Targeted Interventions

Targeted Intervention Indicators

Indicator	TA01 - REQUIRED - The school uses an identification process (including ongoing conversations with instructional leadership teams and data points to be used) for all students at risk of failing or in need of targeted interventions. (2931)		
Status	Tasks completed: 1 of 4 (25%)		
Assessment	Level of Development:	Initial: Limited Development 09/19/2013	
		Objective Met - 10/15/2013 10/15/2013	
	Index:	9	(Priority Score x Opportunity Score)
	Priority Score:	3	(3 - highest, 2 - medium, 1 - lowest)
	Opportunity Score:	3	(3 - relatively easy to address, 2 - accomplished within current policy and budget conditions, 1 - requires changes in current policy and budget conditions)

	Describe current level of development:	<p>After a careful review of the longitudinal data e.g., Summative SOL assessments, formative assessments from benchmarking, Computer Assisted Instructional (CAI) software diagnostic data, and in conjunction with the seven strategic goals established by the Petersburg City Public School Division plus federal/state requirements, the Teaching and Learning School Improvement Plan (SIP) was modified to insure that student performance, teacher and operational efficacy can be achieved during the 2013-14 school year.</p> <p>To realize these set objectives, The SIP indicator, TA01, will focus on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create governance structure that supports a focus on school-wide, instructional leadership, • Building leadership capacity among instructional leadership team members, • Implementing a master schedule that facilitates common planning and maximizes teaching and learning time. • Focus on data-driven teaching and learning programs.
--	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Plan	Assigned to:	Jerome Williams
	How it will look when fully met:	<p>After a careful review of the longitudinal data e.g., Summative SOL assessments, formative assessments through benchmarking, computer Assisted instructional software diagnostic data) and in conjunction with the seven strategic goals established by the Petersburg City Public School Division and federal/state requirements, the Teaching and Learning School Improvement Plan (SIP) was modified to insure that student performance, teacher and operational efficacy can be achieved during the 2013-14 school year. To realize these set objectives, The SIP focused on Building leadership capacity among Instructional leadership team members, Changes in the master schedule to maximize instructional time, focus on data drive decision teaching and learning programs, Implementation of school-wide behavior modification programs, establishment of assessments schedules that facilitates effective Response to Interventions RTI practices with in the school, and establishing performance metrics which are directly to student performance. Organization structure of School 6th grade university (4 teams) 7th grade university (3 teams) Elective University (Includes exploratory teachers and Health/PE) Master Schedule. 70 minute teaching and learning blocks Built in Enrichment/Remediation/Acceleration Blocks) Horizontal common planning, at least 110Minutes per day. PLC/CLT Meet every Monday and Wednesday. Leadership Capacity: Instructional leadership teams consist of Grade level leaders, departments chairs, principal, Assistant Principal, counselors, instructional specialist (Math, Reading and Social studies/Science) Standing Meeting 2nd Monday each month. Faculty Meetings After school first Monday Department meeting third Monday. Students are assessed based upon the student performance data from ARDT SOL performance, I station, ARDT person Response to Intervention Plan TIER 1 Universal screening and benchmarking of all students Identify students at risk by conducting universal screening of academic performance and behavior Provide class wide instruction in a general education setting that utilizes scientific/research-based teaching and intervention methods and continuously monitor progress</p>
	Target Date:	06/30/2014
	Tasks:	
	1. Establish system of governance that will include the creation of an Instructional Leadership Team (ILT), grade level Professional Learning Communities (PLC), and Collaborative Learning Team (CLT).	
	Assigned to:	Jerome Williams
	Added date:	09/19/2013
	Target Completion Date:	08/26/2013

		Comments:	<p>7/29/2013 The Principal met with the Assistant Principals to discuss the formation of the Instructional Leadership Team. Suggestions were offered as to potential members of the team. On 8/5/2013 a meeting was held with the Principal, the Assistant Principal, the counselors, the Instructional Specialist, the Reading Specialist, and the ITRT to further discuss the structure and purpose of the ILT. During the weeks of 8/5/2013 - 8/23/2013, the administrative team conducted interviews with the suggested members and the official Instructional Leadership Team was formed. On 8/27/2013, the first official ILT meeting was conducted. The meeting consisted of the Principal, the Assistant Principals, the Instructional Specialist, the Reading Specialist, the 7th grade level chair, the 6th grade level chair, the Science Department Chair, the English Department Chair, the Social Studies Chair, the Math Department Chair, and the Elective Chairs. During the meeting, the PLC handbook was issued to each member of the ILT. The expectation was given about the PLC meetings being completely instructionally focused. The master schedule was changed this year to allow common planning time for each grade level. PLC meetings are scheduled to take place on Mondays during this common planning time. Elective PLC's take place during 1st block, 6th grade PLC's take place during 2nd block and 7th grade PLC's take place during 5th block. The organizational structure of the school divides the 6th grade into 4 teams and the 7th grade into 3 teams. Each team is composed of 1 English teacher, 1 science teacher, 1 math teacher and 1 social studies teacher. This group makes up a CLT. The CLT meets every Wednesday during the common planning period to discuss instruction as well as providing an opportunity for parents to come in to suggest ways to better help their children. The first CLT meeting took place on 9/18/2013.</p>
		Task Completed:	09/18/2013
		2. During the weekly PLC meetings, teachers will use baseline data obtained from ARDT and STAR reading to provide interventions to students working below grade level and growth opportunities for students at grade level and above.	
		Assigned to:	Jennifer Woodard and Kathleen Parker
		Added date:	09/19/2013
		Target Completion Date:	09/03/2013
		Frequency:	weekly

		Comments:	<p>9/23/13 we reviewed the Algebra Readiness Diagnostic Test (ARDT) scores, which was utilized as an assessment tool to evaluate /23/13 we reviewed the Algebra Readiness Diagnostic Test (ARDT) scores, which was utilized as an assessment tool to evaluate students' skills for content mastery in mathematics, to begin to analyze individual student scores and place them into levels of being: below grade level, at grade level, or exceeding grade level. The data from that pre-assessment: 6th Grade math- 74.11% of students fell below grade level, 23.66% of students were on grade level, and 2.23% of students exceeded their grade level. 7th Grade math- 75% of students fell below grade level, 21.67% of students were on grade level, and 3.33% of students exceeded their grade level. 7th Grade math students that have been listed as advanced, therefore taking 8th grade level math- 37.78% of students fell below 8th grade level, 33.33% of students were on 8th grade level, and 28.89% of students exceeded the incoming expectation of 8th grade level. Star Reading baseline assessments were administered from 9/16/1113 to 9/24/13. The following criteria were used for identifying Grade 6 tier groups: tier 3 – GE 3.9 or below; tier 2 – GE 4.0 – 5.9; and tier 1 GE 6.0 and above. Based on the criteria, 39.0 percent of 6th grade students are in tier 3, 45.6 percent are in tier 2, and 15.3 percent are in tier 1. The following criteria were used for identifying Grade 7 tier groups: tier 3- GE 4.9 or below; tier 2 – GE 5.0 – 6.9; and tier 1 – GE 7.0 and above. Based on the criteria, 53.6 percent of 7th grade students are in tier 3, 30.3 percent are in tier 2, and 16.1 percent are in tier 1.</p>
		3. The leadership team will use a Common Formative Assessment Analysis Form to analyze data retrieved from biweekly and benchmark assessments. The information will be used to identify students in need of remediation or further interventions.	
		Assigned to:	Janet Wright and Sinclair Harris
		Added date:	10/17/2013
		Target Completion Date:	10/07/2013
		Frequency:	twice monthly

		<p>Comments:</p> <p>9/16/2013 the Common Formative Assessment Analysis form (CFA) was created by administration. A copy of this form has been attached to the documents folder in Indistar. The form will be completed collaboratively by grade level and content areas and submitted within 48 hours of biweekly and benchmark assessments. The information that teachers will provide from the form include the identification of students into tiers, data on each priority strand assessed, indicators which need to be remediated, indicators which need to be re-taught, daily strategies and interventions, SPBQ information, and an analysis of questions in regards to Blooms Taxonomy. On 9/21/2013 teachers received a training on the components of the CFA and how it is expected to be completed. Teachers were also trained on how to use the data included within the report. 9/21/2013 teachers brought a copy of the CFA to the PLC meetings to identify students within tiers I, II and III. At that point, it was determined that from the first biweekly assessment administered 9/13/13, for English, 52% of 6th graders scored in tier 3, 39% scored in tier 2, and 9% scored in tier 1. 63% of 7th graders scored in tier 3, 32% scored in tier 2, and 5% scored in tier 1. The second biweekly assessment was administered beginning 9/27/13. Sixty-five percent of sixth graders scored in tier 3, 30% scored in tier 2 and 4% scored in tier 1. Seventy-two percent of 7th graders scored in tier 3, 22% scored in tier 2, and 7% scored in tier 1. The third biweekly assessment was administered beginning 10/11/13. Forty-four percent scored in tier 3, 39% in tier 2 and 17% in tier 1. The third biweekly assessment was administered beginning 10/11/13. Fifty-eight percent scored in tier 3, 34% in tier 2 and 8% in tier 1. For Math, Grade 6: SOL 6.3 (integers, absolute value) 11% in Tier 1, 19% in Tier 2, 69% in Tier 3, SOL 6.5 (positive exponents, perfect squares), 16% in Tier 1, 19% in Tier 2, 65% in Tier 3. Grade 7: SOL 7.1d (determine square roots) 20% in Tier 1, 21% in Tier 2, 59% in Tier 3, SOL 7.1e (absolute value for rational numbers), 17% in Tier 1, 14% in Tier 2, 69% in Tier 3. 7th grade advanced (8th grade level): SOL 8.5 (perfect squares) 8% in Tier 1, 36% in Tier 2, 56% in Tier 3. The students' second bi-weekly scores were: Grade 6: 6.8 (order of operations) 18% in Tier 1, 30% in Tier 2, 52% in Tier 3. Grade 7: SOL 7.3a (model operations of integers) 21% in Tier 1, 22% in Tier 2, 57% in Tier 3, SOL 7.3b (integer operations) 3% in Tier 1, 9% in Tier 2, 88% in Tier 3. 7th grade advanced (8th grade level): SOL 8.4 (order of operations) 11% in Tier 1, 0% in Tier 2, 89% in Tier 3, SOL 8.1b (compare and order fractions, decimals, percent, scientific notation) 14% in Tier 1, 14% in Tier 2, 72% in Tier 3. Grade 6: SOL 6.1 (ratios) 28% in Tier 1, 0% in Tier 2, 72.8% in Tier 3, SOL 6.2a (investigate and describe fractions, decimals, and percent as ratios) 27% in Tier 1, 1% in Tier 2, 72% in Tier 3, SOL 6.2b (identify a given fraction, decimal, or percent from a representation) 20% in Tier 1, 41% in Tier , 39% in Tier 3. Grade 7: SOL 7.1a (negative powers of ten) 23% in Tier 1, 24% in Tier 2, 53% in Tier 3. 7th grade advanced (8th grade level): SOL 8.3a (solve practical problems with percent, ratios, and proportions) 5% in Tier 1, 0% in Tier 2, 95% in Tier 3.</p>
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		4. Develop implementation plan that will address effective intervention strategies for improving student performance on formative assessments which are aligned with SOLs in math, science, reading and social studies. This plan will include the assistance of the central office and the SURN Principal Academy (College of William and Mary)
		Assigned to: Jerome Williams
		Added date: 10/31/2013
		Target Completion Date: 09/03/2013
		Frequency: twice monthly
		Comments: During the ILT meeting on 8/5, the following information was discussed - review of data from previous SOLs and other formative assessments such as benchmark data, achievement gaps and deficits in math and reading, RTI plan to focus on identified tiers (2-3), targeted AMO benchmarks for 2013-14 SY, SOL priority strands from data. ILT Meetings from 9/17 and 10/14 we provided target assistance to teachers whose whole class formative assessment data is below 65% and discussed bi-monthly assessment data in Interactive achievement
Implement	Percent Task Complete:	
	Objective Met:	10/15/2013 10/15/2013
	Experience:	10/15/2013 The Administrative team has formed and instructional leadership team which is made up of all of our specialists, department chairs from each core subject as well as the electives, ITRT and Media Specialist. We have drafted a calendar which indicates that we meet at least once a month, every second Monday after school in the Principal's Conference room. During this meeting, we discuss our SIP and how to best drive instruction through RTI practices. We look at our Indistar tasks and discuss what tasks need to occur in order to meet our objectives and due dates. The PLC has been developed and is made up of all of our instructional staff. The Elective University which consists of the elective teachers meet as one PLC. The 6th Grade University which is made up of 4 team of teachers meet as another PLC and the 7th Grade University which is made up of 3 teams of teachers meet also as a PLC. These PLC meetings take place every Monday during common planning time. CLT's which is made up of four content teachers per team meet every Wednesday.
	Sustain:	10/15/2013 We will continue to meet as a team and review data as the year progresses. We will have to implement changes as our data changes. We will monitor our progress throughout the year to meet all of our objectives.
	Evidence:	10/15/2013 Evidence of implementation include the Peabody School Calendar, Indistar meeting agenda and minutes and data binders kept by Peabody Instructional Leadership team.

Indicator	TA02 - REQUIRED - The school uses a tiered, differentiated intervention process to assign research-based interventions aligned with the individual needs of identified students (the process includes a description of how interventions are selected and assigned to students as well as the frequency and duration of interventions for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students). (2932)		
Status	Tasks completed: 0 of 6 (0%)		
Assessment	Level of Development:	Initial: Limited Development 09/19/2013	
		Objective Met - 10/15/2013	
	Index:	9	(Priority Score x Opportunity Score)
	Priority Score:	3	(3 - highest, 2 - medium, 1 - lowest)
	Opportunity Score:	3	(3 - relatively easy to address, 2 - accomplished within current policy and budget conditions, 1 - requires changes in current policy and budget conditions)

	Describe current level of development:	Current differentiated interventions are based on data received from diagnostic tests, i.e. Carnegie Learning, STAR testing, and Interactive Achievement. School-Wide behavior management program is in the process of being implemented.
Plan	Assigned to:	Sinclair Harris
	How it will look when fully met:	<p>Once fully implemented, a three tiered system will be utilized.</p> <p>Response to Intervention Plan</p> <p>TIER 1</p> <p>Universal screening and benchmarking of all students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify students at risk by conducting universal screening of academic performance and behavior • Provide class wide instruction in a general education setting that utilizes scientific/research-based teaching and intervention methods and continuously monitor progress <p>TIER 2</p> <p>Identifying specific strengths and weaknesses and progress monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure response to previous teaching and interventions • Administer formative assessments and standardized measures, when appropriate, to pinpoint specific areas of difficulty among students who continue to struggle. • Based on test results, tailor group or individual interventions that are progressively more challenging and monitor progress <p>TIER 3</p> <p>Diagnostic testing and intensive progress monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure response to ongoing intensive intervention • Administer comprehensive diagnostic assessments appropriate to individual needs to those who continue to show poor progress • Diagnose skill-set deficiency based on test results and all other available information • Develop individualized remediation (IRP) plans for regular education and special education students and related services and monitor progress • Continue to re-evaluate student progress and change intervention as a result of poor student performance on formative assessments (as needed). <p>Specifics</p> <p>Math: Each student will be required to complete the Person ARDT pre-assessments upon completion; Students will be tiered based upon performance indicators Designated as Tier (I- III). Tier III being the students who require the most support. The solution is ARDT selected lesson 30-45 minutes per day. Carnegie Math and other related strategies by the math specialist.</p> <p>English: AR and I Station, and IA. I station provide teacher driven lessons 45-120 minutes per day. Overall time 5.00 hours. AR required 75 minutes PER- week, therefore with help from scholastic, student will be required to read 15-20 minute PER DAY and totaling 200 minutes per week. The assessment will be monitored after each week. Teachers are to submit T and L audits bi monthly</p>
	Target Date:	10/15/2013
	Tasks:	

		3. The English specialist will monitor tier movement of students who are assigned remedial support for English (grades 6-7)	
		Assigned to:	Kathleen Parker
		Added date:	10/17/2013
		Target Completion Date:	09/30/2013
		Frequency:	twice monthly
		Comments:	<p>Star Reading baseline assessments were administered from 9/16/1113 to 9/24/13. The following criteria were used for identifying Grade 6 tier groups: tier 3 – GE 3.9 or below; tier 2 – GE 4.0 – 5.9; and tier 1 GE 6.0 and above. Based on the criteria, 39.0 percent of 6th grade students are in tier 3, 45.6 percent are in tier 2, and 15.3 percent are in tier 1. The following criteria were used for identifying Grade 7 tier groups: tier 3- GE 4.9 or below; tier 2 – GE 5.0 – 6.9; and tier 1 – GE 7.0 and above. Based on the criteria, 53.6 percent of 7th grade students are in tier 3, 30.3 percent are in tier 2, and 16.1 percent are in tier 1.</p> <p>All students tested selected Accelerated Readers based on their baseline assessments and interests to read independently. In addition, Scholastic Classroom Libraries have been implemented in each classroom. Students read at least sixty minutes per week within their English classes. The biweekly assessments for both sixth and seventh grade correlate with the STAR baseline assessments. The following criteria were used for identifying tier groups: tier 3 – 69% and below; tier 2 – 86-70%; tier 1 – 87 – 100%.</p> <p>The first biweekly was administered 9/13/13. Fifty-two percent of 6th graders scored in tier 3, 39% scored in tier 2, and 9% scored in tier 1. Teachers identified students who missed priority skills and remediated or retaught concepts during the last fifteen minutes of class. Teachers used hands-on activities, peer tutors, stations and small group instruction utilizing specialist and paraprofessionals. The second biweekly assessment was administered beginning 9/27/13. Sixty-five percent of sixth graders scored in tier 3, 30% scored in tier 2 and 4% scored in tier 1. Teachers who had a significant number of students in tier 3 were observed and supported by the reading specialist. Students were pulled and specialist assisted in class with large numbers of remedial students. The third biweekly assessment was administered beginning 10/11/13. Forty-four percent scored in tier 3, 39% in tier 2 and 17% in tier 1.</p> <p>The first biweekly was administered 9/13/13. Sixty-three percent of 7th graders scored in tier 3, 32% scored in tier 2, and 5% scored in tier 1. Teachers identified students who missed priority skills and remediated or retaught concepts during the last fifteen minutes of class. Teachers used hands-on activities, peer tutors, stations and small group instruction utilizing specialist and paraprofessionals. The second biweekly assessment was administered beginning 9/27/13. Seventy-two percent of 7th graders scored in tier 3, 22% scored in tier 2, and 7% scored in tier 1. Teachers who had a significant number of students in tier 3 were observed and supported by the reading specialist. Students were pulled and specialist assisted in class with large numbers of remedial students. The third biweekly assessment was administered beginning</p>

			<p>10/11/13. Fifty-eight percent scored in tier 3, 34% in tier 2 and 8% in tier 1.</p> <p>STAR Reading progress monitoring was administered from October 21 to October 25. The measurement for this test is a grade equivalent score. Thirty-six percent of 6th grade students scored in tier 3 (GE 3.9 and below), 45.4 percent scored in tier 2 (GE 5.0 – 5.9), and 18.1 percent scored in tier 1 (6.0 and above). Fifty-one percent of seventh grade students scored in tier 3 (GE 4.9 and below), 34.2 percent scored in tier 2 (GE 5.0 – 6.9) and 15.2 percent scored in tier 1 (GE 7.0 and above).</p>
		4. The Social Studies specialist will monitor tier movement of students who are assigned remedial support for Social studies (grades 6-7)	
		Assigned to:	Patricia Crocker
		Added date:	10/17/2013
		Target Completion Date:	09/30/2013
		Frequency:	twice monthly
		Comments:	
		5. Weekly PLC and CLT meetings will provide Elective teachers with data on the students that will be receiving Enrichment, Remediation and Acceleration (ERA) services, based on biweekly and benchmark data.	
		Assigned to:	Janet Wright and Sinclair Harris
		Added date:	10/24/2013
		Target Completion Date:	09/09/2013
		Frequency:	weekly
		Comments:	<p>PLC meetings began on 9/9/2013. Elective teachers meet on Tuesdays during 1st block. Core Content Teachers meet during their corresponding planning blocks on Mondays.</p> <p>9/16/2013 core teacher met to identify students who needed additional support. Teachers developed plans to provide to the elective teacher for ERA pull outs. Elective teachers and specialists began utilizing the plans and pulling students out on 9/17/2013. 9/23/2013 core teachers met to revisist students who need interventions based on updated data. New ERA plans were written and provided to elective teachers. Elective teachers provided ERA to students who needed interventions. 9/30/2013, core teachers met to revisist students who need interventions based on updated data. New ERA plans were written and provided to elective teachers. Elective teachers provided ERA to students who needed interventions. Future PLC meetings were held on 10/7, 10/14, 10/21 and 10/28. Each week, core teachers would provide elective teachers with plans on how to assist with the remediation, acceleration or enrichment of students.</p>
		7. The Math Specialist will monitor tier movement of students who are assigned remedial support for math (grades 6-8)	
		Assigned to:	Jennifer Woodard
		Added date:	10/31/2013
		Target Completion Date:	09/30/2013
		Frequency:	twice monthly
		Comments:	

Comments:

9/23/13 we reviewed the Algebra Readiness Diagnostic Test (ARDT) scores, which was utilized as an assessment tool to evaluate students' skills for content mastery in mathematics, to begin to analyze individual student scores and place them into levels of being: below grade level, at grade level, or exceeding grade level. The data from that pre-assessment: 6th Grade math- 74.11% of students fell below grade level, 23.66% of students were on grade level, and 2.23% of students exceeded their grade level. 7th Grade math- 75% of students fell below grade level, 21.67% of students were on grade level, and 3.33% of students exceeded their grade level. 7th Grade math students that have been listed as advanced, therefore taking 8th grade level math- 37.78% of students fell below 8th grade level, 33.33% of students were on 8th grade level, and 28.89% of students exceeded the incoming expectation of 8th grade level. Teaching teams met 9/25/13 to discuss the Interactive Achievement bi-weekly testing assessment data. Students were placed into Tiers based on their scores. Interventions and remediation were discussed and plans were put in place for lessons in each grade level for students who fell into Tier 2, and re-teaching plans for students who were in Tier 3 were discussed and identified with a series of specific direct instructional techniques and varied teaching strategies. The students scored as follows: SOL Grade 6: SOL 6.3 (integers, absolute value) 11% in Tier 1, 19% in Tier 2, 69% in Tier 3, SOL 6.5 (positive exponents, perfect squares), 16% in Tier 1, 19% in Tier 2, 65% in Tier 3. Grade 7: SOL 7.1d (determine square roots) 20% in Tier 1, 21% in Tier 2, 59% in Tier 3, SOL 7.1e (absolute value for rational numbers), 17% in Tier 1, 14% in Tier 2, 69% in Tier 3. 7th grade advanced (8th grade level): SOL 8.5 (perfect squares) 8% in Tier 1, 36% in Tier 2, 56% in Tier 3. To continue to improve the level of mastery for the student learning, the teaching team has met weekly on Tuesday's to discuss data. In addition to this, the team has attended PLC's on Monday to discuss the Common Formative Assessments that the teams have been utilizing to improve data and strand analysis of the SOL's. The students' second bi-weekly scores were: Grade 6: 6.8 (order of operations) 18% in Tier 1, 30% in Tier 2, 52% in Tier 3. Grade 7: SOL 7.3a (model operations of integers) 21% in Tier 1, 22% in Tier 2, 57% in Tier 3, SOL 7.3b (integer operations) 3% in Tier 1, 9% in Tier 2, 88% in Tier 3. 7th grade advanced (8th grade level): SOL 8.4 (order of operations) 11% in Tier 1, 0% in Tier 2, 89% in Tier 3, SOL 8.1b (compare and order fractions, decimals, percent, scientific notation) 14% in Tier 1, 14% in Tier 2, 72% in Tier 3. The math department teaching teams met October 14th to discern the data from the Interactive Achievement October 11th bi-weekly testing session: Grade 6: SOL 6.1 (ratios) 28% in Tier 1, 0% in Tier 2, 72.8% in Tier 3, SOL 6.2a (investigate and describe fractions, decimals, and percent as ratios) 27% in Tier 1, 1% in Tier 2, 72% in Tier 3, SOL 6.2b (identify a given fraction, decimal, or percent from a representation) 20% in Tier 1, 41% in Tier , 39% in Tier 3. Grade 7: SOL 7.1a (negative powers of ten) 23% in Tier 1, 24% in Tier 2, 53% in Tier 3. 7th grade advanced (8th grade level): SOL 8.3a (solve practical problems with percent, ratios, and proportions) 5% in Tier 1, 0% in Tier 2, 95% in Tier 3. The math department is utilizing multiple strategies for remediation, including: games

			to support student involvement and learning (Jeopardy, Who Wants to Be a Millionaire), peer tutoring with partnering specified by the teacher from students who demonstrate understanding, small group tutoring during elective hour and after school, integration of supportive technology programs that track student progress and have mini-lessons (Carnegie Learning, Study Island), use of "push-in" model with the math specialist to support classes identified with highest need, and use of manipulative and hands on learning with materials not previously used. The teams also discussed that each teachers brought specific strengths that we needed to ensure we utilize. The teaching team took note of who had the most students in Tier 1 and Tier 2 for each SOL strand and then discussed exactly what manipulative the teacher used in class and how the teacher gave the lesson. Teachers were asked to model the lesson and the other teachers will implement these new lessons from each teacher in their own classrooms during their re-teaching.
		8. All Math students will be required to remediate through Carnegie Learning and Study Island as an intervention. Tier 2 and 3 students will have an additional day weekly to receive additional assistance. The Math Specialist and paraprofessionals will assist.	
		Assigned to:	Jennifer Woodard and Janet Wright
		Added date:	10/31/2013
		Target Completion Date:	09/16/2013
		Frequency:	twice weekly
		Comments:	Laptops are provided to all math classrooms and labs assignments have been made to all math classrooms to accomplish the completion of Carnegie Learning Program or Study Island Program. Teachers will provide small group instruction to Tier 2 students. 9/13/13 students were enrolled in Carnegie Learning Program and Study Island. 10/9/13 teachers began assigning students specific assignments to assist them with their weaknesses and strengths based off of their Tier 2 data accumulated to this point from their ARDT score and their Interactive Achievement bi-weekly data. Students in Tier 2 are provided additional class time to utilize the computer instruction resources.
		9. In addition to regular instruction, Tier 2 and 3 students will participate in pull out sessions during the day by instructional specialists and support staff for additional intervention to address areas of weakness.	
		Assigned to:	Jennifer Woodard and Janet WRight
		Added date:	10/31/2013
		Target Completion Date:	09/09/2013
		Frequency:	weekly

		Comments:	During pull out sessions students are remediated in specific skills identified by the Interactive Achievement tests in small groups of six or less students per teacher or tutor. The teacher utilizes manipulatives and real world learning experiences to assist in the students understanding of the application of mathematics in their daily role of life. Additionally, solving word problems are remediated each time students are pulled out from class. This vital skill assists students in mathematics, reading, and critical thinking. Weekly pull out sessions began on 10/01/13 and will continue throughout the school year for Tier 2 and 3 students.
Implement	Percent Task Complete:		
	Objective Met:		10/15/2013
	Experience:		10/15/2013 A Common Formative Assessment Analysis form has been created and distributed to all instructional staff. We met as a team to describe in detail how the form would be utilized after each biweekly and benchmark assessment. The form includes a section where teachers will disaggregate their own data. Individual objectives are identified and students are placed into tiered groups. The teachers are then required to identify remediation and re-teaching. strategies for each tiered group. Instructional Specialist are used to aid in incorporating the remediation strategies and the pull out of students. Our elective teachers are also being utilized in reading and math remediation. We are utilizing ARDT results to target students needing extra help as well. Teachers are remediating those students and all students will take Strand tests to ensure mastery of each objective. Administration and specialist will monitor all progress as the year continues.
	Sustain:		10/15/2013 The Common Formative Assessment Analysis Form is a document that will be utilized throughout the year. Identifying students into tiers will also be something that will change as our student increase knowledge and move out of lower tiers. We will constantly monitor the progress of our students through data analysis.
	Evidence:		10/15/2013 All teachers are required to complete and keep data binders which identifies the tiered groups and remediation and re-teaching strategies.

Indicator	TA03 - REQUIRED - The school uses a monitoring process (including a multidisciplinary team that meets regularly to review student intervention outcome data and identifies "triggers" and next steps for unsuccessful interventions) for targeted intervention students to ensure fidelity and effectiveness. (2933)		
Status	Tasks completed: 2 of 3 (67%)		
Assessment	Level of Development:	Initial: Limited Development 09/19/2013	
		Objective Met - 10/15/2013	
	Index:	9	(Priority Score x Opportunity Score)
	Priority Score:	3	(3 - highest, 2 - medium, 1 - lowest)

	Opportunity Score:	3	(3 - relatively easy to address, 2 - accomplished within current policy and budget conditions, 1 - requires changes in current policy and budget conditions)
	Describe current level of development:	Master Schedule. 70 minute teaching and learning blocks Built in Enrichment/Remediation/Acceleration Blocks) Horizontal common planning, at least 110Minutes per day. PLC/CLT Meet every Monday and Wednesday. Leadership Capacity: Instructional leadership teams consist of Grade level leaders, departments chairs, principal, Assistant Principal, counselors, instructional specialist (Math, Reading and Social studies/Science) Standing Meeting 2nd Monday each month. Faculty Meetings After school first Monday Department meeting third Monday. Students are assessed based upon the student performance data from ARDT SOL performance, I station, ARDT person	
Plan	Assigned to:	Jerome Williams	
	How it will look when fully met:	Upon complete implementation, benchmark scores will be level across content area and teacher, with all teachers meeting the required thresholds. There will be consistency in the quality of teaching and learning throughout the school. This will be evident in lesson plans and formative assessments. Technology will be implemented throughout weekly lesson plans. Common planning and PLC meetings will ensure that professional developments are delivered so that teachers can incorporate a variety of learning strategies in their lessons.	
	Target Date:	06/13/2014	
Tasks:			
		1. The established PLC meetings, on Mondays and CLT meetings, on Wednesdays will be used to report successful intervention strategies that teachers have used through out the week. The intructional Leadership Team will determine if strategies should continue or if they need to be modified.	
		Assigned to:	Janet Wright and Sinclair Harris
		Added date:	09/19/2013
		Target Completion Date:	09/03/2013
		Frequency:	weekly
		Comments:	CLT and PLC meetings took place on 9/3, 9/5, 9/9, 9/11, 9/13, 9/23, 9/30, 10/7, 10/9, 10/14, 10/21, 10/28. Under Teaching and Learning Strategies, teachers are to, on a weekly basis, report the remediation and reteaching strategies used and provide information from their Common Formative Assessment Forms which indicate the movement of students from tier to tier. During the 9/23/2013 meeting, teachers brought a copy of their first CFA to the PLC meetings to identify students within tiers I, II and III. The ILT recieved the information and provided feedback to the staff.
		Task Completed:	09/03/2013

		2. The instructional Leadership Team will meet the second Monday of every month to discuss the data that has been collected from benchmarks and biweekly assessments. The team will assess which interventions seem to be working and which are ineffective. The information collected during this session will be given to teachers during upcoming PLC meetings.	
		Assigned to:	Jennifer Woodard
		Added date:	09/19/2013
		Target Completion Date:	09/20/2013
		Frequency:	monthly
		Comments:	The first ILT meeting was held on 9/16/2013. No biweekly data was available at that time but the team focused on how to improve instruction and remediate students based on data from teacher tests. During the 10/14/2013 meeting, Each content was asked to report "where we are now". English stated that they were getting ready for benchmark assessments by preparing packets for students, creating stations and having student pull-outs. Targeted Assisted students are reviewing biweekly data during ERA. The specialist is going into the classes and assisting both academically and behaviorally. Math indicated that they were using stations to review for benchmarks as well as peer tutoring, review packets, pullouts, after school tutoring, Carnegie Learning and pulling most missed questions from biweekly onto do now activities. Social Studies is making packets, utilizing after school remediation, pairing higher performing students with low performing students, interactive notes, class discussions and incorporating Hattie's High Yield Strategies. We have identified students and grouped them into tiers. We have identified their needs and worked on RTI. Staff has been designated and tasked with monitoring instructional activities.
		Task Completed:	09/20/2013
		3. Based on data from ARDT, each Student will be assigned ARDT strand tests to assess mastery of weak concepts after teacher remediation. ARDT Strands will be monitored until all students are at grade level or beyond.	
		Assigned to:	Jennifer Woodard and Janet Wright
		Added date:	10/31/2013
		Target Completion Date:	11/18/2013
		Frequency:	weekly

		Comments:	9/23/13 we reviewed the Algebra Readiness Diagnostic Test (ARDT) scores, which was utilized as an assessment tool to evaluate students' skills for content mastery in mathematics, to begin to analyze individual student scores and place them into levels of being: below grade level, at grade level, or exceeding grade level. The data from that pre-assessment: 6th Grade math- 74.11% of students fell below grade level, 23.66% of students were on grade level, and 2.23% of students exceeded their grade level. 7th Grade math- 75% of students fell below grade level, 21.67% of students were on grade level, and 3.33% of students exceeded their grade level. 7th Grade math students that have been listed as advanced, therefore taking 8th grade level math- 37.78% of students fell below 8th grade level, 33.33% of students were on 8th grade level, and 28.89% of students exceeded the incoming expectation of 8th grade level. 9/25/2013 teachers received their data and the specialist met with all grade levels to explain how strand tests would be assigned and remediated. Teachers began the remediation of material. Strand tests to begin during 2nd nine weeks.
Implement	Percent Task Complete:		
	Objective Met:		10/15/2013
	Experience:		10/15/2013 There are 4 CLT's within our 6th Grade University and 3 CLT's within our 7th Grade University. We also have a CLT made up of our Elective teachers. These CLT's are required to meet once a week on Wednesday. During this meeting, teachers discuss student performance and we also utilize this time to invite parents into the discussion to see how to best improve our student performance in class. Student reports have been received from ARDT, teachers received their data, teachers are remediating students and strand tests are being assigned. We selected an Algebra Readiness teacher and are now in the process of assigning students to Algebra Readiness.
	Sustain:		10/15/2013 CLT's will continue to meet once a week. Teachers will keep minutes of their meetings and this will be documented into Indistar. Administration will monitor the meetings and respond to concerns from the team.
	Evidence:		10/15/2013 All meeting agendas and minutes are documented in Indistar. The new nine week schedules will reflect students assigned to Algebra Readiness. The Peabody school calendar will also reflect meeting times and dates.